

J. Donaldson

PHILANTHROPIST.

CINCINNATI, WEDNESDAY FEBRUARY 8, 1843.

WHOLE NO. 336

VOLUME VII. NO. 24.

THE PHILANTHROPIST.
IS PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY BY
GAMALIEL BAILEY, JR.
OFFICE, SIXTH STREET, NORTH SIDE, BETWEEN
VINE AND RACE, TWO DOORS WEST OF
COLLEGE STREET,
CINCINNATI.

TERMS—TWO DOLLARS per annum if paid within six months after subscription.

To encourage subscription by companies of persons, twenty copies will be sent to one Post Office for 30 dollars, paid in advance. There must be no deduction from this amount for payment of agents.

TERMS OF ADVERTISING.

One square of sixteen lines, or less one insertion, 50
" " each additional insertion, 5.00
" " for six months without alteration, 5.00
" " with alteration, 6.00
Business cards, each, per annum, 2.00

A liberal discount will be allowed on long advertisements.

N. B. Any individual procuring five subscribers paying in advance, and forwarding the money, shall be entitled to a copy for one year.

Lawyers Cards.

DANIEL RAYMOND,
COUNSELLOR AT LAW.

Office Third Street, opposite the Post Office.

JOHN JOLLIFFE,

ATTORNEY AND COUNSELLOR AT LAW.

OFFICE, Third st., between Mica and Sycamore, opposite the Post Office, Cincinnati.

He will practice in Clermont and Hamilton counties, and continue to practice in Brown, until his business in that county shall be closed.

Dec. 27, 1842. 12-11.

A. R. CHASE,

ATTORNEY AT LAW and Notary Public, will attend to all business entrusted to his charge with promptness and fidelity. Office West Third street near Main.

Feb. 20, 1843.

WILLIAM BIRNEY,

Attorney at Law, Cincinnati, Ohio.

WILL attend promptly to the collection of claims, to cases in Bankruptcy and to all other professional business which may be confided to their care, in the County, State and Federal Courts.

Office, Main Street, between 5th and 7th, opposite Gano.

Feb. 20, 1843.

ROBERT H. FOLGER,--Attorney and Counsellor at Law, and Solicitor in Chancery, Massillon.

Will attend to the collection of claims, or other professional business, in the counties of Stark, Holmes, Tuscarawas, Carroll, Columbiana, Summit, and Portage. He has leave to refer to

Hon. H. C. Whittlesey, Washington City, D. C.

John Wilson, Steubenville, ".

John Slane, Columbus, "

Messrs. Stanford, Sullivan & Co., New York.

Dibble & Pray & Co.

Z. & R. M. Otis, Brothers & Co., Boston.

James and Simeon Cleveland, Ohio.

G. & A. Wells, Wellsville, "

J. & S. Rawson, Massillon, "

Leona & Kelly, "

P. Hamby, ".

Edson Atica, Esq., Toledo.

Samuel Church, Esq., Pittsburgh, Pa.

52-16

JAMES G. BIRNEY, Attorney and Counsellor at Law, State of Ohio, Michigan.

J. G. Birney will also act as Land Agent in the land districts of the (Sigourney) county in. He will make investments for others in lands; pay over for non-residents their taxes, and give information generally to persons interested in this part of the country, or desirous of becoming immigrants to it.

Sigourney, July, 1842.

JOHN L. LAMBERT, Attorney and Counsellor at Law, Office, South East corner of Fourth and Main streets.

July 30, 1842.

CHASE & BALL, Attorneys at Law, East third street, Cincinnati.

July 9, 1842.

EDWARD KENNEDY, Attorney at Law, Office on Main street, East side, three doors above 34.

July 30, 1842.

CHARLES E. BRYANT, MANNER CHAPIN, BRYANT & CHAPIN.

ATTORNEYS at law, office S. W. corner of Main and Courts streets.

July 9.

MASON WILLSON,--Attorney and Counsellor at Law, North East corner of Columbus and Main street.

July 9th, 1842.

POETRY.

Massachusetts to Virginia.

BY JOHN G. WHITTIER.

The blast from Freedom's northern hills, upon its southern way,

Bears greeting to Virginia, from Massachusetts Bay—

No word of haughty challenging—nor battle-bugle's peal,

No steady tread of marching files, nor clang of horsemen's steel.

A thousand sails of Commerce swell, but none are spread for war.

We hear thy threats, Virginia—thy stormy words and high Swell harshly on the southern winds, which melt along our sky!

Yet, not one brown, hard hand, foregoes its honest labor here;

No bower of cut mountain oaks suspends his axe in fear.

What means the Old Dominion?—hath she forgot the day, When over her conquered valleys swept the Briton's steel

—aray—

And side by side, with sons of hers, the Massachusetts men Encountered Tarleton's charge of fire, and stout Corn walla.

la, then?

Forgets she how the Bay State, in answer to the call, Other old house of Burgess, spoke out from Faneuil Hall?

When, echoing back her Henry's cry, came pulsing on each breath

Of northern winds, the thrilling sounds of "LIBERTY OR DEATH!"

What asks the Old Dominion? If now her sons have proved

False to their fathers' memory—false to the faith they loved;

If she can scoff at Freedom, and its Great Charter spurn,

Most we of Massachusetts, from Truth and Duty turn?

We hunt your bondmen, flying from slavery's hateful hell—

Our voices, at your bidding, take up the bloodhounds yell—

We gather at your summons, above our fathers' graves,

From freedom's holy altar-homes to tear your wretched slaves!

THE PHILANTHROPIST.

IS PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY BY

GAMALIEL BAILEY, JR.

OFFICE, SIXTH STREET, NORTH SIDE, BETWEEN

VINE AND RACE, TWO DOORS WEST OF

COLLEGE STREET,

CINCINNATI.

Thank God!—not yet so vilely, can Massachusetts bow, The spirit of her early time is with her even now; Dream not because her pilgrim blood moves slow, and calm, and cool, She thus can stop her charles neck, a sister's slave, and tool!

All that a sister State should do, all that a free State may, Heart, hand, and purse we proffer, as in our early day; But that one dark, loathsome burden, ye must stagger with, alone, And reap the bitter harvest which ye yourselves have sown!

Hold while ye may your struggling slaves, and bade God's free air, With woman's shrill beneath the lash, and manhood's wild despair;

Cling closer to the "cleaving curse" that writes upon your planks,

The blasting of Almighty wrath, against a land of chains.

Still shame your gallant ancestry, the cavaliers of old,

By watching round the shambles where human flesh is sold—

Gloat o'er the new-born child, and count his market value when

The maiden's mother's cry of wo shall pierce the slaver's den!

Lower than plummets soundeth, sink the Virginian issue,

Plant, if ye will, your fathers' graves with rankest weeds of shame;

Be, if ye will, the scandal of God's fair universe—

We wash our hands forever, of your sin, and shame, and curse.

A voice from lips wherein the coal from freedom's shrive hath been,

Thrilled, as but yesterday, the hearts of Berkshire's mountain-men;

The echoes of that solemn voice are sadly hoarser still in all our many valleys, on every wind-swept hill.

And when the prowling man-thief came hunting for his prey,

Beneath the very shadow of Bunker's shaft of grey,

How through the free lips of the son, the father's warning spoke;

How from his bonds of trade and sect the Filthy city broke!

A hundred thousand right arms were lifted up on high;

A hundred thousand voices sent back their loud reply;

Through the thronged towns of Fader the starting tumults rang.

And up from bench, and standing loom, her young meadow-sweet sprang.

The voice of free, broad Middlesex—of thousands as of one—

The shout of Bunker calling to that Lexington—

From Norfolk's ancient villages—from Plymouth's rocky bound;

To where Nantucket feels the arms of ocean close her round;

From Rich and rural Worcester, where through the calm repeat;

Of cultured vales and fringing woods, the gentle Nashua flows,

To where Wachusett's wintry blasts the mountain cedar stir;

Swelled up to heaven the thrilling cry, of "God save Latinamer!"

And sandy Barnstable rose up, wet with the salt seas spray—

And Bridget sent her unerring shout down Narragansett bay;

Along the ocean's countenance she flung her bold, the bold, the bold!

And the cheer of Hampshire's woodmen swept down from Holyoke Hill.

The voice of Massachusetts!—Of her free sons and daugh-

ters—

Deaf calling unto deep about—the sound of many waters;

Against the bough of that voice, what tyrant power shall stand?

No feters in the Bay State!—No slave upon her land!

Look to it well, Virginian!—In calmness we have borne,

In answer to our faith and trust, your insolent and your

scorn;

You're spurn'd our kindest counsels—you're hooted for our lives—

And shak'd round our hearths and homes your manacles and gav'!

We wage no war—we lift no arm—we fling no torch with in,

We leave ye with your bondmen—to wrestle while ye can,

With the strong, upward tendencies, and God-like soul of man!

But for us end for our children, the vow which we have given.

For freedom and humanity, is registered in Heaven:

No slave-hunt in our borders—no pirate on our strand!

No feters in the Bay State—no slave upon our land!

LETTER FROM WALTER YANCY.

Monte Gilead, Marion county, Ohio, January 19, 1842.

FRRIEND BAILEY:—

In my last letter, I informed you, that it was my intention to pass through Clark county, where I expected to lecture and operate for your paper. Accordingly I commenced my labors at Green Plain, where I found many staunch and untiring friends of the bleeding slave, who rendered me all the assistance in their power, to facilitate the object of our agency. Here I delivered three lectures and obtained some donations to the Ohio American Anti-slavery Society. The next place I visited, was South Charleston, where I had the pleasure of meeting with Thos. Morris and Jno. O. Wattles, whose efforts there contributed greatly to the interest of our meeting. Thence I went to Springfield, where I expected to deliver a lecture, but found that it was out of my power to obtain a sufficient audience, in consequence of the poor condition of the roads. I accordingly took a walk of a mile or two, and obtained a sufficient audience, and delivered my lecture. In the mean time, some of my neighbors, who had not been used to such a lecture, but had been somewhat indignant, and were determined to go to Norwalk and liberate the slaves, had accordingly taken a walk of half a mile, and were about to leave when I called them back, and said, "Come back, and let us have a discussion on the subject of slavery, and let us not be separated from each other." They accordingly gave themselves up, and were ordered to leave my house, and go to the tavern, where I suppose they were fed. From thence, they were issued a warrant for my arrest, and I was taken to Norwalk, for trial before the justice who issued the warrant. In the mean time, some of my neighbors, who had not been used to such a lecture, but had been somewhat indignant, and were determined to go to Norwalk and liberate the slaves, had accordingly taken a walk of half a mile, and were about to leave when I called them back, and said, "Come back, and let us have a discussion on the subject of slavery, and let us not be separated from each other." They accordingly gave themselves up, and were ordered to leave my house, and go to the tavern, where I suppose they were fed. From thence, they were issued a warrant for my arrest, and I was taken to Norwalk, for trial before the justice who issued the warrant. In the mean time, some of my neighbors, who had not been used to such a lecture, but had been somewhat indignant, and were determined to go to Norwalk and liberate the slaves, had accordingly taken a walk of half a mile, and were about to leave when I called them back, and said, "Come back, and let us have a discussion on the subject of slavery, and let us not be separated from each other." They accordingly gave themselves up, and were ordered to leave my house, and go to the tavern, where I suppose they were fed. From thence, they were issued a warrant for my arrest, and I was taken to Norwalk, for trial before the justice who issued the warrant. In the mean time, some of my neighbors, who had not been used to such a lecture, but had been somewhat indignant, and were determined to go to Norwalk and liberate the slaves, had accordingly taken a walk of half a mile, and were about to leave when I called them back, and said, "Come back, and let us have a discussion on the subject of slavery,

THE PHILANTHROPIST

tered himself—that he was doing a superior act of humanity. But his life must go for the life of the object of his ill-timed pity.

Depraved human nature often evidences its wickedness, in acting as though vain men were wiser than God. Mr. Elmaker, a popular civilian, lately wrote a book, in which he exclaims with much ability and to very good effect on the abuses of civil government, among which he classes capital punishment. After using all the arguments his gigantic mind could think of, which however were not very potent, he concludes with a wish that this evil may so on have an end, that evidently originated in barbarity. When Mr. Elmaker ought to have known that it was invention of man at all, and an express command of God, given as early as the days of Noah—surely the oldest record that man knows any thing about. And yet Mr. Elmaker ventures to say it originated in barbarity. With due respect to his great talents, I will venture to call it downright arrogance. It is true, barbarous nations have practised capital punishment, but will this prove that the thing itself is barbarous? I think not.

E. VANHORN.

THE PHILANTHROPIST,

EDITED BY G. BAILEY, JR.

CINCINNATI.

Wednesday, February 8, 1843.

Rights of Colored Seamen.

That colored seamen, on board northern vessels, entering southern ports, in the prosecution of their legitimate business, should be taken from the work and incarcerated, is a serious injury to shipmasters and the mercantile interest. That colored citizens of the free states, going under such circumstances into southern ports, should be imprisoned, is a flagrant outrage on their rights, a palpable violation of the federal constitution and a gross insult to the sovereignty of the free states.

That the flag of Britain should afford protection to colored American seamen in southern ports, which the American flag is unable to do, is a disgrace to the nation.

In view of these facts, one would suppose that the free state representatives in Congress, to a man, would be in favor of immediate measures to secure the rights of these seamen. And indeed, the vote on the printing of Mr. Winthrop's report, the other day, indicated an awakening spirit on the part of the north. Since then, however, the serviles have been whipped in—the slaveholder has again shown himself the master of Congress. Were the slaves of the south as detestably mean as these white menials of the slaveholder, at the north, we might labor for their emancipation on strict principles of justice, but as for pitying them, that would be out of the question.

On the 23 of January, Botts of Virginia moved a re-consideration of the order of the House to print five thousand extra copies of the reports from the committee of commerce, relating to colored seamen. One of these, remember, was in favor of the south, but the slaveholders did not dare to have the truth go out, though the contradiction went with it. If, on examination, he should find an argument on the one side or the other calculated to tally excitement, he would have no objection to the publication; but if there was any thing to inflame the public mind, he should be opposed.—No doubt, the slaveholder would cover of these outrages.

Mr. Winthrop made some harmless remark, and Mr. Calhoun of Mass., moved to lay the motion on the table.

Mr. Wise stated the law of Virginia, about free blacks, and said, it seemed some colored men had been arrested under this law—and he wanted to know whether the report of the majority were designed to prevent Virginia from exercising her own laws within her own limits! And yet Virginia has undertaken to punish New York for passing laws within her own limits—laws, differing from those of Virginia, in this, that they do not violate the federal constitution. To catch the serviles, he called for the yeas and nays,—and by a vote of 112 to 88, the House refused to lay the motion to reconsider on the table. Mr. Botts' motion then prevailed and the motion to print five thousand extra copies of the reports, was laid on the table, yeas 104, nays 84.

And thus again, the poor, mean-spirited north bowed its neck to receive the yoke of the slaveholders of the South.

Common Schools in Kentucky.

The report of the Superintendent of Common Schools in Kentucky, appears to us, rather meager. If we recollect, Bishop Smith, the superintendent some years since, was cashiered for stating too many unpalatable truths. Perhaps Mr. Brush deems it expedient, to be somewhat chary of his information. We gather from the report that the counties, adopting the school system, find it difficult to obtain from the government their share of the school fund. One of the commissioners, after reporting from four adopting districts, says, “the other districts are waiting to see whether any encouragement will be given by the state.” The commissioners of Christian county write—“During the present year, no district in this county has adopted the common school system. The prospect for the success of the scheme is less encouraging, and there is less interest manifested by the community on this great subject, owing mainly, we think, to the failure in receiving the proportion of the state fund.”

Another thing we notice, is, that out of 92 counties in the state, but 21 have adopted the school system; and but 2069 children are at school in those, though the number of children, between the ages of seven and seventeen, in all the counties, forming the basis of the school fund, is 113,259.—There is but one place, in which the superintendent alludes to this failure of the common school system, and then the allusion is such as would never convey to any mind, not familiar with the facts, the true state of the case. “The course of public instruction,” he says, “has not advanced and spread over the entire community, as its inescapable value requires.”

And this is all, we suppose, it is prudent for him to disclose. Why not come out honestly and announce, that the cause of common schools in Kentucky has failed, and must fail; and that there is but one way, to revive it and make it flourish, which is, to put an end to slavery, thereby arousing energy and enterprise, and peopling the vast solitudes now owned by lordly nabobs, so that there

may be enough enlightened people in a district to sustain a school! This would never do; for the object of his ill-timed pity.

Depraved human nature often evidences its wickedness, in acting as though vain men were wiser than God. Mr. Elmaker, a popular civilian, lately wrote a book, in which he exclaims with much ability and to very good effect on the abuses of civil government, among which he classes capital punishment. After using all the arguments his gigantic mind could think of, which however were not very potent, he concludes with a wish that this evil may so on have an end, that evidently originated in barbarity. When Mr. Elmaker ought to have known that it was invention of man at all, and an express command of God, given as early as the days of Noah—surely the oldest record that man knows any thing about. And yet Mr. Elmaker ventures to say it originated in barbarity. With due respect to his great talents, I will venture to call it downright arrogance. It is true, barbarous nations have practised capital punishment, but will this prove that the thing itself is barbarous? I think not.

What would be the result? There would then be but two parties in the country—the great democratic slavery party, and the liberty party. Men would then find their place. Like to like—the slavery men who were once whigs would rally

under the black banner of slavery: the liberty men who were democrats, would range, with those who had been freemen in the whig ranks, around the standard of Freedom, whose folds were first given to the breeze by the Liberty men, the men who were the first to emancipate themselves from the thralldom of the reigning parties.

Then for a clear field, and fair fight—each party under its own colors!—

The true against the false democracy—the democracy without limitation, against the democracy with limitation—Organic against Caducous democracy—Democracy, with love in its heart and a blessing in its hand for every being stamped with the image of God, against the Democracy of gags, and whips, and thumbscrews and gynes. “To this complexion it must come.” And may God hasten the day!

under the black banner of slavery: the liberty men who were democrats, would range, with those who had been freemen in the whig ranks, around the standard of Freedom, whose folds were first given to the breeze by the Liberty men, the men who were the first to emancipate themselves from the thralldom of the reigning parties.

Then for a clear field, and fair fight—each party under its own colors!—

The true against the false democracy—the democracy without limitation, against the democracy with limitation—Organic against Caducous democracy—Democracy, with love in its heart and a blessing in its hand for every being stamped with the image of God, against the Democracy of gags, and whips, and thumbscrews and gynes.

“To this complexion it must come.” And may God hasten the day!

Kidnapping in Indiana.

Some time last summer, we received an account of a gross outrage committed in Davis county, Ia., upon a colored man; but it was written so illegibly that we laid it by till we could get leisure to decipher it. In some way it escaped our attention, till within a few days, when, in overhauling some papers, it caught our eye.

Our correspondent is a zealous friend of human rights, and his statement, we think, may be relied upon. It is this. Some time last June, two colored men passing northwardly, near Washington, Davis county, were seized without warrant as runaways, by a gang of negro-hunters. They succeeded in breaking away, but one of them named Robert Thomas, in great difficulty, was retaken, and cast into jail. A writ of habeas corpus was granted, at the instance of Peter Stephenson, a citizen of the place, but the sheriff, Franklin Willbrite, refused to serve it, till threatened with legal process. It was arranged, as was supposed, with the connivance of the sheriff, that two men named Jacob Wykoff and Isaac McCormick, should be ready with their horses, to take the colored men [Destroy slavery, and you take away the ground and provocation of insurrection.] The rich should respect the poor, and the poor should respect the rich; but it is manifest, this can only be, under the system of free-labor. Mutual respect and love are based upon our nature and destiny, and these things should be realized in truth; [but, how much respect and love do the slaveholder and slave bear to each other?] We hold that it is the duty of the privileged classes to correct the present inequalities to the proper advantage of the unprivileged, [and therefore it is the imperative duty of the legislature to commence at once the work of emancipation.] Human equality should be the great object of all, but if the favored classes [slave-owners] will not correct and adjust the present state of things, it becomes the bidden duty of the less favored [slaves] to demand justice. I shall therefore entreat the rich and influential masters [to do justice], and encourage the poor and friendless [slaves] to demand it as ascribed by it, and abhorrent to it.

It is too much the case that the “gentleman” of leisure, of wealth or education commands all the respect of society, while the “man” of industry is disregarded or neglected.

These artificial distinctions have a thousand times too much weight [and will have, till we make the men of industry, the slaves, free, give them the Bible, and the benefits of the common schools.] It is not the most intellectual man—not the most learned scholar—not the wealthy nabob or the most accomplished “gentleman” who is most useful or contributes most to the good of society! No! Those who are most respected in the eyes of the world, are not the most useful citizens! If they are not the most useful, they should not be entitled to the most respect!

Those who are the most valuable citizens are generally the least respected, and by this means labor is disengaged, and rendered unshakable [as it always will be, so long as you make property of your laborers—for it is just as impossible that the labor should be honorable, where the mass of the laborers are slaves, as that pug-noses should be respectable, in a community where men with pug-noses are regarded as *unclean* and disengaged for any public station.] But, it is to be hoped, that a better tone of thinking will prevail on this subject, and that the useful inferior will become more influential and more respectable than those who contribute nothing to the general good; [and we are strengthened in this hope, by the efforts of those noble champions of equality at the north, the modern abolitionists, whose principle it is, that] Labor should not only be respected but it should be a recommendation to a man. It should be regarded as actual wealth and active capital instead of being disengaged and despised.

Let the thousands who labor, endeavor to understand their rights and assert them; [and this may seem incendiary when it is recollected, that three laborers constitute the majority in this state; but we go for justice.] Let them think and know that they are as worthy, at least of consideration as those who are idle. Those who earn their living by useful industry, [the slaves,] should feel that they are quite as useful citizens as those who live on the industry of others; [the masters,] and, understanding these rights, should maintain them on all occasions and at all hazards. The laborer too frequently allows himself to be treated with contempt—too often does he allow the haughty aristocrat during the transactions of business to treat him as a mere *yellow*, *fall* which arises from his allowing this aristocrat to own him, as property. We could mention several of those who would be nabobs who are in the habit of mistreating those who perform what is sometimes called the drudgery of society. The man who drives his dray or works in the shop is not treated with half that consideration he is entitled to. We know of cases of men calling themselves “Democrats” who look upon those who perform ordinary labor, [the slaves,] as far below them and treat them as mere *serfs*, [brutes;] but we take the liberty of stating that such men are far from being democrats. It is a foul slander upon democracy to call them democrats. They are in *feeling* and *in action* hypocritical and arbitrary aristocrats who have no feeling whatever in common with their species. The laborer [slave] should teach such men their proper places by demanding not only strict justice but gentlemanly treatment. The laborer [slave] should give all the arrogance and overbearing drones [slaveholders] to understand that he too is a man, made by God, after his own image.

Hurrah for Mississippi abolitionism! It is made of stern stuff. It goes ahead of any thing we have seen, north of Mason and Dixon's line.—Can it be possible that Mr. Fall is yet alive, that the Sentinel still stands! If so, we would give them the *fraternal* hug, and we shall send our paper to advise them of our purpose. We hope our brother of the Sentinel will reciprocate, and as a token of his sympathy, send us the future numbers of his paper, devoted to this interesting subject—the elevation of the working classes or slaves. One thing, however, leads us rather to suspect that the Sentinel is not entirely sincere in this matter, for in the same number of the paper from which the foregoing article is taken, is an advertisement for a *Trust Sale*, the latter part of which is as follows.

“I shall expose at public sale for cash, to the highest bidder, on the plantation of the late V. C. Hicks, in the county aforesaid, on the 24th day of June next, the following described negroes to wit:

May, Delea, Caroline, Horace,
Miles, Fian, Nancy and her child Ferdinand,
Glam, Phoeby and big Jorden, Jo,
Nathan, Jerry,
Tempy, Harry,
Meredy,

“We rejoice to see abolition doctrines in their extremest applications, advocated boldly at Vicksburg. The following article, we copy from the Sentinel, a democratic paper published at that place. In order to make its meaning plain and comprehensive, we have inserted in different places, in the body of the article, explanatory remarks, which may always be known by being enclosed in brackets.

“THE WORKING, OR USEFUL CLASSES: [COMMONLY CALLED SLAVES.]

To discharge the proper functions of civil society, a variety of parts are to be performed, all of which are equally necessary to the harmony of the whole. There are many pursuits which are looked upon as menial, notwithstanding they may be the most useful and important; [which is owing to our system of slave-labor.] No one should be thought less of for his occupation or the performance of his part, but each one respected in proportion to the good which he may contribute to society; [and therefore the slave should be more abundantly honored than the master.] If this

principle be correct, humble pursuits should be dignified, not only in the eyes of those who follow them, but in the estimation of the world, [but this cannot be done, till we elevate the working classes from the condition of *brutes* to that of men.] A man should not think meanly of himself or his occupation; [unless he be a slaveholder or a slave-driver.] Labor should be exalted by the spirit of independence given it by the native dignity of the laborer; [and the way to effect this is to adopt the wages-principle;] while more “fashionable” pursuits [such as gambling, horse-racing, land-speculating, &c.] should be deprived of a share of their importance.

No particular pursuit should be elevated, but all should be respectable, [except the pursuit of runaways, and the silly pride which disdains labor, should be frowned down [for it is said, he that will not work, shall not eat, which is evidently pointed at planters and such like.]] In this way we would bring about equality, mutual respect and good will, [to all which the slave system is deadly hostile.] The object would be to elevate false asbasement and bring down silly pride—to restore to the slave his rights, and strip the master of his usurped pretensions.] Nothing but worth, virtue and intelligence should be respected. The poor should be as good, but no better than the rich. A man should be regarded as a man in his own skin as well as white—for the outer covering given by nature, has no more to do with a man's manhood, than the artificial one furnished by the tailor.]—The hand of labor should be as respectable as the hand of luxury [and more so, for while the slave produces, the master only consumes.] Let there be no pride or contempt on the part of the rich, and there will be no envy on the part of the poor.

[Destroy slavery, and you take away the ground and provocation of insurrection.] The rich should respect the poor, and the poor should respect the rich; but it is manifest, this can only be, under the system of free-labor. Mutual respect and love are based upon our nature and destiny, and these things should be realized in truth; [but, how much respect and love do the slaveholder and slave bear to each other?] We hold that it is the duty of the privileged classes to correct the present inequalities to the proper advantage of the unprivileged, [and therefore it is the imperative duty of the legislature to commence at once the work of emancipation.] Human equality should be the great object of all, but if the favored classes [slave-owners] will not correct and adjust the present state of things, it becomes the bidden duty of the less favored [slaves] to demand justice. I shall therefore entreat the rich and influential masters [to do justice], and encourage the poor and friendless [slaves] to demand it as ascribed by it, and abhorrent to it.

It is too much the case that the “gentleman” of leisure, of wealth or education commands all the respect of society, while the “man” of industry is disregarded or neglected.

These artificial distinctions have a thousand times too much weight [and will have, till we make the men of industry, the slaves, free, give them the Bible, and the benefits of the common schools.] It is not the most intellectual man—not the most learned scholar—not the wealthy nabob or the most accomplished “gentleman” who is most useful or contributes most to the good of society! No! Those who are most respected in the eyes of the world, are not the most useful citizens! If they are not the most useful, they should not be entitled to the most respect!

Those who are the most valuable citizens are generally the least respected, and by this means labor is disengaged, and rendered unshakable [as it always will be, so long as you make property of your laborers—for it is just as impossible that the labor should be honorable, where the mass of the laborers are slaves, as that pug-noses should be respectable, in a community where men with pug-noses are regarded as *unclean* and disengaged for any public station.] But, it is to be hoped, that a better tone of thinking will prevail on this subject, and that the useful inferior will become more influential and more respectable than those who contribute nothing to the general good; [and we are strengthened in this hope, by the efforts of those noble champions of equality at the north, the modern abolitionists, whose principle it is, that] Labor should not only be respected but it should be a recommendation to a man. It should be regarded as actual wealth and active capital instead of being disengaged and despised.

Let the thousands who labor, endeavor to understand their rights and assert them; [and this may seem incendiary when it is recollected, that three laborers constitute the majority in this state; but we go for justice.] Let them think and know that they are as worthy, at least of consideration as those who are idle. Those who earn their living by useful industry, [the slaves,] should feel that they are quite as useful citizens as those who live on the industry of others; [the masters,] and, understanding these rights, should maintain them on all occasions and at all hazards. The laborer too frequently allows himself to be treated with contempt—too often does he allow the haughty aristocrat during the transactions of business to treat him as a mere *yellow*, *fall* which arises from his allowing this aristocrat to own him, as property. We could mention several of those who would be nabobs who are in the habit of mistreating those who perform what is sometimes called the drudgery of society. The man who drives his dray or works in the shop is not treated with half that consideration he is entitled to. We know of cases of men calling themselves “Democrats” who look upon those who perform ordinary labor, [the slaves,] as far below them and treat them as mere *serfs*, [brutes;] but we take the liberty of stating that such men are far from being democrats. They are in *feeling* and *in action* hypocritical and arbitrary aristocrats who have no feeling whatever in common with their species. The laborer [slave] should teach such men their proper places by demanding not only strict justice but gentlemanly treatment. The laborer [slave] should give all the arrogance and overbearing drones [slaveholders] to understand that he too is a man, made by God, after his own image.

Hurrah for Mississippi abolitionism! It is made of stern stuff. It goes ahead of any thing we have seen, north of Mason and Dixon's line.—Can it be possible that Mr. Fall is yet alive, that the Sentinel still stands! If so, we would give them the *fraternal* hug, and we shall send our paper to advise them of our purpose. We hope our brother of the Sentinel will reciprocate, and as a token of his sympathy, send us the future numbers of his paper, devoted to this interesting subject—the elevation of the working classes or slaves. One thing, however, leads us rather to suspect that the Sentinel is not entirely sincere in this matter, for in the same number of the paper from which the foregoing article is taken, is an advertisement for a *Trust Sale*, the latter part of which is as follows.

“I shall expose at public sale for cash, to the highest bidder, on the plantation of the late V. C. Hicks, in the county aforesaid, on the 24th day of June next, the following described negroes to wit:

May, Delea, Caroline, Horace,
Miles, Fian, Nancy and her child Ferdinand,
Glam, Phoeby and big Jorden, Jo,
Nathan, Jerry,
Tempy, Harry,
Meredy,

“We rejoice to see abolition doctrines in their extremest applications, advocated boldly at Vicksburg. The following article, we copy from the Sentinel, a democratic paper published at that place. In order to make its meaning plain and comprehensive, we have inserted in different places, in the body of the article, explanatory remarks, which may always be known by being enclosed in brackets.

“THE WORKING, OR USEFUL CLASSES: [COMMONLY CALLED SLAVES.]

To discharge the proper functions of civil society, a variety of parts are to be performed, all of which are equally necessary to the harmony of the whole. There are many pursuits which are looked upon as menial, notwithstanding they may be the most useful and important; [which is owing to our system of slave-labor.] No one should be thought less of for his occupation or the performance of his part, but each one respected in proportion to the good which he may contribute to society; [and therefore the slave should be more abundantly honored than the master.] If this

The Christian World and Slavery.

After a long absence, the Christian World again greets us. Without doubt, it is the most beautiful periodical we receive. It maintains its catholic, courteous spirit, and is filled with instructive articles. We wish the editor could find time to favor us more frequently with the productions of his own graceful pen.

THE PHILANTHROPIST

The Church and Municipal Law.
From the Watchman.
To the Editor of the Philadelphia Christian Observer.

THE "EASTERN MAN" AGAIN.

MY DEAR BROTHERS.—In your reply to my remarks, you lay down the following principle:—“The Church has no right to sit in judgment on the law of the land, and declare it immoral, or to declare those acts *imoral* which the law requires or *sanctions*.”

The writer in the Biblical Repository asserts, that the Church has no right even to presume the law of the land to be contrary to the word of God, “decency (says he) does not allow the *supposition*”; and he contends, that for the Church to take any condemnatory action on any practice sanctioned and protected by the law of the land, is *lynch law*, and the worst feature of Romanism.

He says further:

“It is not true, that the Church is an authoritative expositor of the word of God. We acknowledge no such functionary. It belongs to the legislative bodies in our country, in their proper spheres to determine, whether proposed laws contravene the divine law; and this determination, so far as concerns their act, is conclusive upon all, within the regular operation of this act.”

It seems, then, that neither the Church nor the individual Christian, is the proper expositor of God’s word; but the *legislative bodies in our country*, at least in respect to all things that pertain to the “municipal law.”

You are aware that in the city of Paris, there is, or was a sound Protestant Church under the pastoral care of a very pious man, Rev. Mark Wilkes. The “municipal law” of France, as applied to Paris, licenses and sanctions prostitution, just as the municipal law of Hamburg does, except that it requires only a certificate from a physician, of the good health of the applicant, and omits the requisition of the certificate of baptism from the minister. Supposing some women in Mr. Wilkes’ Church, should so far degenerate as to become prostitutes under this law, (the case is certainly a possible one); Has “the church no right to declare the act *immoral* which the law *sanctions*?” has Mr. Wilkes’ Church no right, in this case, even “to make the *supposition* that the *municipal law* contrary to the law of God”—does “it belong to the *legislative body* in France to determine whether this law contravenes the divine law?”

According to the Philadelphia Observer and the writer in the Biblical Repository, Mr. Wilkes’ Church, in this case, in its Church capacity, must be entirely silent on the conduct of those members, it must pass no resolution condemning of their act, it must inflict no church censure on them; they only act in accordance with the “municipal law,” and it belongs to the legislative body, and not to the church, to determine whether this law contravenes the word of God or no!

I know you object to this illustration on the score of “aste;” but it must use it for the same reason that I would use charcoal (black stuff as it is,) to detect the presence of arsenic, it precipitates the poison so completely.

The “municipal law,” my dear brother, is no better than the “civil institution;” it is the same thing under another name.

Again you remark:

“The great Head of the church has never made it her duty to pronounce *judicially* in condemnation of acts which the State requires. This work has never been committed to the ministry of reconciliation, nor to the *judicatory* of the church.”

Such were the faithful, indignant expressions, made use of by our blessed pattern in condemning the popular sins of the great. How thinkest thou, He would have treated a *sovereign* of transcendent talents, of great literary and legal attainments, of commanding eloquence, and who was seeking to crown himself with the honor of being governor of Rome, but, who at the same time would pay his laborers *no wages*, would not allow them to enter into the legalized state of wedlock; who had denied them the privilege of training up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord—subjected them to a law, which cut them off from the opportunity of reading the Holy Scriptures, and absolutely claimed the right and exercised the power of holding them as his property, and of driving them to perform any kind, or any amount of labor, which his interest or caprice might dictate; or even to sell them like dumb animals in the market, who in case of an insult offered to his supposed dignity, had demanded satisfaction by permitting to shoot the individual, and who was notorious for an unrestrained indulgence in gambling, concubinage, etcetera! Dost thou think He would have placed such an one on the *seat of honor*, when his discourses should have assembled to thy homage and adoration to the author of their being; or that in parting with such an one, his language would have been, “*fare thes well Henry, God be with thee and us toll!*”

After I had written thus far, the Philanthropist brought me the passing intelligence, that the Friends in Indiana, who have religion enough to keep them from such base idolatry of men, and to enable them to stand faithful to their profession, in their opposition against slavery, are about to dissolve their connection with a degenerated and corrupt church. May they be strengthened to hold up a pure and holy standard, in perfect accordance with the religion of the gospel; may they never compromise with sin, however popular it may be, an may they cast no obstacles in the way of efforts for the promotion of that which they acknowledge to be a “righteous cause.” I especially rejoice, in the prospect of the new organization of a church, by Friends in Indiana, because I trust it will be founded on such principles, that I can find in it a home for my worn spirit.

In the reign of Trajan, the law required all Christians to repair to the idol temples and burn incense to the idol Gods. Many Christians did so, and their act was not only a “lawful” one, in the sense in which you use the term, but they could not avoid doing it without directly transgressing the law of the State. But the church declared their act sinful and excommunicated them. Did the church do wrong?—Did the church forget that “neither our Saviour nor his apostles never made any supposition, that the municipal law is contrary to the word of God, though living under Tiberius and Nero,“ much worse men than Trajan?

In the reign of Diocletian, the law required all Christians to bring their bibles before the municipal officers and burn them. Many Christians did so. The church declared their act sinful, and excommunicated them. Did the church do wrong, and forget the good example of Christ and his apostles, though living under much worse emperors than Diocletian?

On the trial of faithful, as recorded by John Bunyan, the Chief Justice charges the jury as follows:

“There was an act made in the days of Pharaoh the Great, servant to our Prince, that lest those of a contrary religion should multiply and grow too strong for him, their males should be thrown into the river.” There was also an act made in the days of Nebuchadnezzar the Great, another of his servants, that whoever would not fall down and worship his golden image, should be thrown into a fiery furnace. There was also an act made in the days of Darius, that whose, for some time called upon any God but him, should be cast into the Lion’s den. Now, the substance of these laws, this rebellion broken, not only in thought (which is not to be borne,) but also in word and deed; which must, therefore, needs be intolerable.”

All these laws were passed by the proper legislative authorities of the respective countries in which they took effect, and by men certainly no worse than Tiberius and Nero. Was it the duty therefore, of good men to submit to these acts? Was the determination of these legislative bodies, so far as concerns their acts, conclusive upon all, within the regular operation of those acts? And is my Lord Chief Justice Hagedorn right in his application of your principles?

Numerous other illustrations are at hand, in our own times and states. In many communities of the United States, the “municipal law” licensess and sanctions theatres, race courses, and gaming houses. In those places is the church precluded by “respect for the law,” from the right of disciplining her members for theatre-going, horse-racing, and gaming?

It is true, the law requires no man to go to the theatre, to race horses, or to gamble—and it is also true, that the law requires no man to hold slaves. And if it did, what then?

It is, moreover, true, that we are not asking for the application of church discipline to all indiscriminately who bear the legal relation of slave-holders; we are simply claiming the right to bear our own testimony, in our own ecclesiastical bodies, against the wicked practice of holding and treating human beings as property,—and in our own churches, of disciplining or not, according to the nature and circumstances of each case, that may properly come before us.

Letter from Arnold Buffum.

BOSTON, 1st mo. 24th 1843.
My Dear Wife.—I have been very sick; but thanks to Dr. Brandreth, to good nursing, and to cold water, under the blessing of a kind Providence, I am still among the living, and rapidly recovering my wonted state of health.

For some time previous to my arrival here, I have been laboring from place to place, among people who manifested such a willingness to hear the cries of the poor perishing slaves, as, added to my desire of soul, that they should *act* not hear, but *feel*, and *act* as they would have others act, were they in bonds, seemed to give a double impetus to the flow of my thoughts and feelings, and often chained me in the speaker’s stand from 2 to 3 hours, and this daily, and in some instances twice a day, until my strength became exhausted to that degree, that on arriving here, I found myself completely broken down. I took my bed, with pain in my head and back, my throat extremely sore, a high fever, and during sleep, wild delirious visions. I happened to have in my pocket two Brandreth pills, which I took, after having bathed my feet in warm water, in addition to which, I drank every half hour freely of cold water. By these means, and a large supply of blankets, I kept up a free perspiration for two days and nights, when my fever and all my pains gave way; my throat is still sore but steadily improving. The two Brandreth pills, and the cold water are the only medicine I have taken, and I would not have exchanged them for all the contents of a drug store. If people only knew the value of these articles as a remedy for disease, they might almost dispense with druggists and physicians.

But my dear, where shall we find a remedy for the moral diseases of men? Some say in the preaching of the gospel; but what they call the gospel, has been preached for a long time, and yet moral evil sits as secure on his throne as ever. If such preaching is ever to cast him down, is it not high time that his battlements began to give way?

When the gospel of JESUS CHRIST is preached in purity, in power, and in love, it will be accompanied with that divine energy, which will shake their foundations all the bulwarks of sin, and annihilate forever all moral evil. But this glorious result will be effected only, by preaching that gospel, which the Lord Jesus Christ preached, during the days of his personal ministry on the earth. He levelled the shaft of his eloquence, and truth, and love, directly against the great popular sins of the world. The dread of an exciting subject, never kept his mouth dumb, where sin was to be condemned. His language to high professors, who thanked God that they were not as other men were, was plain, pointed and denunciatory. “Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, for ye shut the kingdom of heaven against men; for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in.”

Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites; for ye devour widows’ houses and for a pittance make long prayers, therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation.”

Such were the faithful, indignant expressions, made use of by our blessed pattern in condemning the popular sins of the great. How thinkest thou, He would have treated a *sovereign* of transcendent talents, of great literary and legal attainments, of commanding eloquence, and who was seeking to crown himself with the honor of being governor of Rome, but, who at the same time would pay his laborers *no wages*, would not allow them to enter into the legalized state of wedlock; who had denied them the privilege of training up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord—subjected them to a law, which cut them off from the opportunity of reading the Holy Scriptures, and absolutely claimed the right and exercised the power of holding them as his property, and of driving them to perform any kind, or any amount of labor, which his interest or caprice might dictate; or even to sell them like dumb animals in the market, who in case of an insult offered to his supposed dignity, had demanded satisfaction by permitting to shoot the individual, and who was notorious for an unrestrained indulgence in gambling, concubinage, etcetera! Dost thou think He would have placed such an one on the *seat of honor*, when his discourses should have assembled to thy homage and adoration to the author of their being; or that in parting with such an one, his language would have been, “*fare thes well Henry, God be with thee and us toll!*”

After I had written thus far, the Philanthropist brought me the passing intelligence, that the Friends in Indiana, who have religion enough to keep them from such base idolatry of men, and to enable them to stand faithful to their profession, in their opposition against slavery, are about to dissolve their connection with a degenerated and corrupt church. May they be strengthened to hold up a pure and holy standard, in perfect accordance with the religion of the gospel; may they never compromise with sin, however popular it may be, an may they cast no obstacles in the way of efforts for the promotion of that which they acknowledge to be a “righteous cause.” I especially rejoice, in the prospect of the new organization of a church, by Friends in Indiana, because I trust it will be founded on such principles, that I can find in it a home for my worn spirit.

In the reign of Trajan, the law required all Christians to repair to the idol temples and burn incense to the idol Gods. Many Christians did so, and their act was not only a “lawful” one, in the sense in which you use the term, but they could not avoid doing it without directly transgressing the law of the State. But the church declared their act sinful and excommunicated them. Did the church do wrong?—Did the church forget that “neither our Saviour nor his apostles never made any supposition, that the municipal law is contrary to the word of God, though living under Tiberius and Nero,“ much worse men than Trajan?

In the reign of Diocletian, the law required all Christians to bring their bibles before the municipal officers and burn them. Many Christians did so. The church declared their act sinful, and excommunicated them. Did the church do wrong, and forget the good example of Christ and his apostles, though living under much worse emperors than Diocletian?

On the trial of faithful, as recorded by John Bunyan, the Chief Justice charges the jury as follows:

“There was an act made in the days of Pharaoh the Great, servant to our Prince, that lest those of a contrary religion should multiply and grow too strong for him, their males should be thrown into the river.” There was also an act made in the days of Nebuchadnezzar the Great, another of his servants, that whoever would not fall down and worship his golden image, should be thrown into a fiery furnace. There was also an act made in the days of Darius, that whose, for some time called upon any God but him, should be cast into the Lion’s den. Now, the substance of these laws, this rebellion broken, not only in thought (which is not to be borne,) but also in word and deed; which must, therefore, needs be intolerable.”

All these laws were passed by the proper legislative authorities of the respective countries in which they took effect, and by men certainly no worse than Tiberius and Nero. Was it the duty therefore, of good men to submit to these acts? Was the determination of these legislative bodies, so far as concerns their acts, conclusive upon all, within the regular operation of those acts? And is my Lord Chief Justice Hagedorn right in his application of your principles?

Numerous other illustrations are at hand, in our own times and states. In many communities of the United States, the “municipal law” licensess and sanctions theatres, race courses, and gaming houses. In those places is the church precluded by “respect for the law,” from the right of disciplining her members for theatre-going, horse-racing, and gaming?

It is true, the law requires no man to go to the theatre, to race horses, or to gamble—and it is also true, that the law requires no man to hold slaves. And if it did, what then?

It is, moreover, true, that we are not asking for the application of church discipline to all indiscriminately who bear the legal relation of slave-holders; we are simply claiming the right to bear our own testimony, in our own ecclesiastical bodies, against the wicked practice of holding and treating human beings as property,—and in our own churches, of disciplining or not, according to the nature and circumstances of each case, that may properly come before us.

There are other facts before us. For instance, the South is indebted to the shoe manufacturers of Lynn, about \$3,000,000! and to the city of New York, more than \$100,000! No wonder New York merchants fail. What a burden they have to carry! The debt of Louisiana, divided among the free white population of that State, is at the rate of \$130 for each white man, woman and child. We think the prosperity of Southern merchants and planters is not much more indicative of providential favor, than that of Northerners who support them in a state of irredeemable and perpetual bankruptcy.—Southerners cry out that the conduct of abolitionists is “not to bear, but feel, and act as they would have others act, were they in bonds, seemed to give a double impetus to the flow of my thoughts and feelings, and often chained me in the speaker’s stand from 2 to 3 hours, and this daily, and in some instances twice a day, until my strength became exhausted to that degree, that on arriving here, I found myself completely broken down. I took my bed, with pain in my head and back, my throat extremely sore, a high fever, and during sleep, wild delirious visions. I happened to have in my pocket two Brandreth pills, which I took, after having bathed my feet in warm water, in addition to which, I drank every half hour freely of cold water. By these means, and a large supply of blankets, I kept up a free perspiration for two days and nights, when my fever and all my pains gave way; my throat is still sore but steadily improving. The two Brandreth pills, and the cold water are the only medicine I have taken, and I would not have exchanged them for all the contents of a drug store. If people only knew the value of these articles as a remedy for disease, they might almost dispense with druggists and physicians.

But my dear, where shall we find a remedy for the moral diseases of men? Some say in the preaching of the gospel; but what they call the gospel, has been preached for a long time, and yet moral evil sits as secure on his throne as ever. If such preaching is ever to cast him down, is it not high time that his battlements began to give way?

When the gospel of JESUS CHRIST is preached in purity, in power, and in love, it will be accompanied with that divine energy, which will shake their foundations all the bulwarks of sin, and annihilate forever all moral evil. But this glorious result will be effected only, by preaching that gospel, which the Lord Jesus Christ preached, during the days of his personal ministry on the earth. He levelled the shaft of his eloquence, and truth, and love, directly against the great popular sins of the world. The dread of an exciting subject, never kept his mouth dumb, where sin was to be condemned. His language to high professors, who thanked God that they were not as other men were, was plain, pointed and denunciatory. “Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, for ye shut the kingdom of heaven against men; for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in.”

Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites; for ye devour widows’ houses and for a pittance make long prayers, therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation.”

Such were the faithful, indignant expressions, made use of by our blessed pattern in condemning the popular sins of the great. How thinkest thou, He would have treated a *sovereign* of transcendent talents, of great literary and legal attainments, of commanding eloquence, and who was seeking to crown himself with the honor of being governor of Rome, but, who at the same time would pay his laborers *no wages*, would not allow them to enter into the legalized state of wedlock; who had denied them the privilege of training up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord—subjected them to a law, which cut them off from the opportunity of reading the Holy Scriptures, and absolutely claimed the right and exercised the power of holding them as his property, and of driving them to perform any kind, or any amount of labor, which his interest or caprice might dictate; or even to sell them like dumb animals in the market, who in case of an insult offered to his supposed dignity, had demanded satisfaction by permitting to shoot the individual, and who was notorious for an unrestrained indulgence in gambling, concubinage, etcetera! Dost thou think He would have placed such an one on the *seat of honor*, when his discourses should have assembled to thy homage and adoration to the author of their being; or that in parting with such an one, his language would have been, “*fare thes well Henry, God be with thee and us toll!*”

After I had written thus far, the Philanthropist brought me the passing intelligence, that the Friends in Indiana, who have religion enough to keep them from such base idolatry of men, and to enable them to stand faithful to their profession, in their opposition against slavery, are about to dissolve their connection with a degenerated and corrupt church. May they be strengthened to hold up a pure and holy standard, in perfect accordance with the religion of the gospel; may they never compromise with sin, however popular it may be, an may they cast no obstacles in the way of efforts for the promotion of that which they acknowledge to be a “righteous cause.” I especially rejoice, in the prospect of the new organization of a church, by Friends in Indiana, because I trust it will be founded on such principles, that I can find in it a home for my worn spirit.

In the reign of Trajan, the law required all Christians to repair to the idol temples and burn incense to the idol Gods. Many Christians did so, and their act was not only a “lawful” one, in the sense in which you use the term, but they could not avoid doing it without directly transgressing the law of the State. But the church declared their act sinful, and excommunicated them. Did the church do wrong?—Did the church forget that “neither our Saviour nor his apostles never made any supposition, that the municipal law is contrary to the word of God, though living under Tiberius and Nero,“ much worse men than Trajan?

In the reign of Diocletian, the law required all Christians to bring their bibles before the municipal officers and burn them. Many Christians did so. The church declared their act sinful, and excommunicated them. Did the church do wrong, and forget the good example of Christ and his apostles, though living under much worse emperors than Diocletian?

On the trial of faithful, as recorded by John Bunyan, the Chief Justice charges the jury as follows:

“There was an act made in the days of Pharaoh the Great, servant to our Prince, that lest those of a contrary religion should multiply and grow too strong for him, their males should be thrown into the river.” There was also an act made in the days of Nebuchadnezzar the Great, another of his servants, that whoever would not fall down and worship his golden image, should be thrown into a fiery furnace. There was also an act made in the days of Darius, that whose, for some time called upon any God but him, should be cast into the Lion’s den. Now, the substance of these laws, this rebellion broken, not only in thought (which is not to be borne,) but also in word and deed; which must, therefore, needs be intolerable.”

All these laws were passed by the proper legislative authorities of the respective countries in which they took effect, and by men certainly no worse than Tiberius and Nero. Was it the duty therefore, of good men to submit to these acts? Was the determination of these legislative bodies, so far as concerns their acts, conclusive upon all, within the regular operation of those acts? And is my Lord Chief Justice Hagedorn right in his application of your principles?

Numerous other illustrations are at hand, in our own times and states. In many communities of the United States, the “municipal law” licensess and sanctions theatres, race courses, and gaming houses. In those places is the church precluded by “respect for the law,” from the right of disciplining her members for theatre-going, horse-racing, and gaming?

It is true, the law requires no man to go to the theatre, to race horses, or to gamble—and it is also true, that the law requires no man to hold slaves. And if it did, what then?

It is, moreover, true, that we are not asking for the application of church discipline to all indiscriminately who bear the legal relation of slave-holders; we are simply claiming the right to bear our own testimony, in our own ecclesiastical bodies, against the wicked practice of holding and treating human beings as property,—and in our own churches, of disciplining or not, according to the nature and circumstances of each case, that may properly come before us.

</